



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

gustus (cf. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*, pp. 13 *et seqq.*); and therefore Arnold's contention (p. 59) that "the 'dyarchy' never in reality existed" is invalidated, because his theory is based in part on the errors mentioned above. Some minor points which need correction may be noted briefly. It is reasonably certain that Augustus held the office of censor (p. 17). The census for a senator was 1,000,000, not 1,200,000 sesterces = £10,000 (p. 18); cf. Dio 54.17. Suetonius (Aug. 41) has been misled in mentioning the latter sum. Augustus removed 200 men from the Senate (p. 17), it is true, but he added some new members; cf. Dio. 52.42. Probably the Senate, not the emperor, took the census in the senatorial provinces (p. 28); cf. Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 55. One would infer from the statement on p. 177 that the present Pantheon was constructed by Agrippa. Of course it is the work of Hadrian. Of misprints or slips one may mention "concilium" for *consilium* (p. 66), and "to impose" "great privileges" (p. 178). In the chapter on "The Domestic Policy of Augustus" something should have been said of the emperor's regulations concerning the knights and the Augustales.

The four chapters on the provinces of Gaul, Spain, Arabia, Egypt, Greece, and Asia Minor give an admirable account of the geography of these regions and of the conditions of life in them. They take into account the latest investigations, and form an excellent pendant to the author's sketch of provincial government, to be found in his prize essay on *Roman Provincial Administration* (1879). The different methods which the Romans adopted in the East and the West, and their comparative failure in substituting Roman for Greek civilization in the Orient, are brought out with great clearness. We miss a treatment of the cult of the emperor in these discussions of social conditions in the provinces. Probably Samos should be added to the two Roman colonies in Asia mentioned on p. 232. The phrase, *ἔτους κολωνίας*, applied to it in an inscription cited in the *Rheinisches Museum*, N. F., XXII., p. 325, seems to point to this conclusion. The editor's bibliographical note on the provinces (pp. 246-248) is not thoroughly satisfactory. Even for the general reader Halgan's *Les Provinces Sénatoriales* (1898), Chapot's *La Province Romaine Proconsulaire d'Asie* (1904), and other books of like character should have been mentioned.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

L'Enseignement des Lettres Classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin: Introduction à l'Histoire des Écoles Carolingiennes. Par M. ROGER, Docteur ès Lettres. (Paris: A. Picard et Fils. 1905. Pp. xviii, 457.)

M. ROGER's book is true to the programme of its title. It traces conscientiously the distressed currents of education in Latin letters from the time of the rhetorician poet Ausonius to the period when the great

educator Alcuin labored so effectively to meet the needs of Frank and Saxon learners. The book does even more; for it goes back of the period of its nominal commencement, and considers the scheme of study as laid out by Quintilian. Thence it advances, noting the abandoned threads of classic discipline, and following those which merely decayed and did not break.

The literary skill of Boissier or the constructive imagination of Ozanam would be needed to make a discussion of Latin education in these centuries interesting or especially suggestive. M. Roger is but fair-minded and painstaking. He is occupied with a time of literary decay, and one as to which our information on the topic of Latin studies is so unsatisfactory that a work like the one before us necessarily becomes a thesis on the paucity of our veritable knowledge upon the subject of the book. Nor would the author's modesty lay claim to having exhausted such information as may be had. One notes that his treatment of classical education in Italy is inadequate. He refers to Giesebrecht's *De Litterarum Studiis apud Italos*, etc., but appears unacquainted with Novati's *Influsso del Pensiero Latino sopra la Civiltà Italiana del Medio Evo* (1899) and Salvioli's *Istruzione Pubblica in Italia nei Secoli VIII, IX e X* (1898). Again, in what the author has to say of Fortunatus, one might have expected a reference to Wilhelm Meyer's *Der Gelegenheitsdichter Venantius Fortunatus (Abhandlungen d. kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., n. f., Bd. IV., No. 5, 1901)*; and some reference, when discussing Caesarius of Arles to Carl F. Arnold's elaborate monograph, *Caesarius von Arelate und die gallische Kirche seiner Zeit* (1894).

In general, however, M. Roger's learning is sufficiently exhaustive; and while on many branches of his subject he has little to offer that is novel, we think that he has made an important contribution to the discussion of Latin letters in Ireland during the fifth and following centuries. This is a matter on which there has been enough genial generalizing; but we know of no such thorough investigation of the somewhat squalid data as M. Roger has presented. His theme is not the entire history of the Irish schools, but is confined to the sixth and the first half of the seventh century, when the Irish were "les représentants les plus actifs de la culture classique dans l'Europe occidentale" (p. 202). With the close of the seventh century, the centre of interest passes, as he says, to Great Britain, where Aldhelm, Bede, Egbert, and Alcuin take up the torch of learning, and prepare "le programme du futur enseignement des écoles carolingiennes" (*ibid.*). M. Roger seems to express the kernel of his thesis when he says: "Au lieu de considérer l'histoire de la culture classique en Irlande, du iv^e au ix^e siècle, comme un mouvement provenant d'une impulsion unique, il faut y distinguer des époques différentes, caractérisées par la diversité des influences subies, et ne pas rechercher une solution, qui explique à la fois la teinture

classique de Columban et la culture philosophique de Scot Érigène" (p. 207).

The method of the author seems sound. The attention of scholars has frequently been attracted to the brilliant performance of certain men of the ninth century, who probably were Irish (Erigena, Sedulius Scotus, and others) but lived chiefly on the continent. It is manifestly hazardous to draw, from the character of their work, inferences as to the state of learning in Ireland two or three centuries before. For the sixth and seventh centuries, M. Roger finds that certain groups of Irish monks devoted themselves to the study of Scripture and the works of the Latin Fathers. The efficient prosecution of their sacred studies was the motive impelling them to acquire a knowledge of Latin letters. From this they were led on to a study of rhetoric and the classic writers. The author in part ascribes the readiness with which Irish students passed from sacred to profane studies to the circumstance that Irishmen had inherited no aversion to the profane character of these writings, since the heathen Irish past, from which the race had been converted, had no connection with classic paganism (pp. 236-237).

We cannot follow M. Roger further, for instance through his consideration and incidental minimizing of the work of the Irish for the diffusion of letters on the continent in the sixth and seventh centuries (p. 403 *et seqq.*); but will close with the remark that whatever credit he takes from the Irish, he carries to the account—and quite properly as we think—of the great Anglo-Saxons who learned and labored at Jarrow and York. They indeed had drawn from Irish teachers, but had profited quite as much from the learning brought to England by the African Hadrian and Theodore of Tarsus, whom Pope Vitalian sent in 669 to take charge of the See of Canterbury.

HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Codex Diplomaticus Moenofrancofurtanus. Urkundenbuch der Reichsstadt Frankfurt. Herausgegeben von JOHANN FRIEDRICH BOEHMER. Neubearbeitung auf Veranlassung und aus den Mitteln der Administration des Dr. Johann Friedrich Boehmer'schen Nachlasses. Erster Band, 794-1314; zweiter Band, 1314-1340. Bearbeitet von FRIEDRICH LAU. (Frankfurt am Main: Joseph Baer and Company. 1901, 1905. Pp. xii, 562; vii, 645.)

THE edition of documents relating to Frankfort which Boehmer announced in 1826 and finished ten years later seemed so worthy in purpose and so well done that it was widely imitated. It became the forerunner and in great part the model of many collections of sources upon German towns. It had, however, along with the opportunity of pioneer